C	se 2:13-cv-09350-JC Document 1 File	ed 12/19/13 Page 1 of 12 Page ID #:6
1 2 3 4 5	BRIAN T. DUNN, ESQ. (SBN 1765) JAMON R. HICKS, ESQ. (SBN 232) MEGAN R. GYONGYOS, ESQ. (SI) THE COCHRAN FIRM CALIFOR 4929 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1010 Los Angeles, California 90010 Telephone: (323) 435-8205 Facsimile: (323) 282-5280 bdunn@cochranfirm.com jhicks@cochranfirm.com mgyongyos@cochranfirm.com	FILED 2747) BN 285476) NIA 2013 DEC 19 PM 3: 05 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES BY
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff EMMANUEL	BRACY
8	UNITED STATI	ES DISTRICT COURT
10	CENTRAL DISTF	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 12	EMMANUEL BRACY, an individual,	CASE NO CV 13 - 09350
13	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CITY OF LOS ANGELES; DETECTIVE CARL WORRELL; DETECTIVE DONALD WALTHERS; DETECTIVE RICHARD GUZMAN; DETECTIVE RANDY RICO; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants.	1. Violations of Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1983) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
25 26 27 28		1

3 4

5 6

7

10 11

12

14

13

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- Jurisdiction is vested in this court under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3)-(4) for violations of the 1871 Civil Rights Enforcement Act, as amended, including 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1367(a).
- Venue is proper in the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C. 2. § 1391(a)-(b).

PARTIES

- At all relevant times mentioned herein, Plaintiff EMMANUEL 3. BRACY (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "Plaintiff" or "MR. BRACY") was a resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- Defendant CITY OF LOS ANGELES (hereinafter "CITY") is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein was, a municipal entity or political subdivision of the United States, organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant DETECTIVE CARL WORRELL (hereinafter "DETECTIVE WORRELL") is, and at all relevant times herein was, a resident of the County of Los Angeles and State of California. Further, at all times relevant to the acts and omissions herein alleged, Defendant DETECTIVE WORRELL was a detective employed by the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, and was acting under color of law and within the course and scope of his employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant DETECTIVE DONALD WALTHERS (hereinafter "DETECTIVE WALTHERS") is, and at all relevant times herein was, a resident of the County of Los Angeles and State of California. Further, at all times relevant to the acts and omissions herein alleged, Defendant DETECTIVE WALTHERS was a detective employed by the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, and was acting under color of law and within the course and scope of his employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department.

- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant DETECTIVE RICHARD GUZMAN (hereinafter "DETECTIVE GUZMAN") is, and at all relevant times herein was, a resident of the County of Los Angeles and State of California. Further, at all times relevant to the acts and omissions herein alleged, Defendant DETECTIVE GUZMAN was a detective employed by the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, and was acting under color of law and within the course and scope of his employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant DETECTIVE RANDY RICO (hereinafter "DETECTIVE RICO") is, and at all relevant times herein was, a resident of the County of Los Angeles and State of California. Further, at all times relevant to the acts and omissions herein alleged, Defendant DETECTIVE RICO was a detective employed by the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, and was acting under color of law and within the course and scope of his employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers are, and at all relevant times mentioned herein were, residents of the County of Los Angeles and State of California. Further, at all times relevant to the acts and omissions herein alleged, said Defendant DOE Officers were police officers employed by the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, and were acting under color of law and within the course and scope of their employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department.
- 10. A comprehensive and timely Claim for Damages was presented to the City of Los Angeles in substantial compliance with Government Code § 910, et seq. Said Claim for Damages was denied by the City of Los Angeles on June 5, 2011.

///

28 ///

7

1011

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

23

2425

26

///

27

28 | ///

- 11. On June 28, 2010, numerous criminal charges relating to the incidents and events hereinafter set forth were filed against Plaintiff. Certain of these criminal charges were pending before a superior court within the meaning of California Government Code § 945.3 until September 21, 2012, when Plaintiff was convicted of some of those charges.
- Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of those 12. Defendants named herein as DOE Defendants. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege said Defendants' true names and capacities when that information becomes known to him. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that these DOE Defendants are legally responsible and liable for the incident, injuries, and damages hereinafter set forth, and that each of said Defendants proximately caused the injuries and damages by reason of negligent, careless, deliberately indifferent, intentional, willful, or wanton misconduct, including the negligent, careless, deliberately indifferent, intentional, willful, or wanton misconduct in creating and otherwise causing the incidents, conditions, and circumstances hereinafter set forth, or by reason of direct or imputed negligence or vicarious fault or breach of duty arising out of the matters herein alleged. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint to set forth said true names and identities of the unknown named DOE Defendants when they are ascertained.
- 13. Each of the individual Defendants sued herein is sued both in his individual and personal capacity, as well as in his official capacity.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants was the agent and/or employee and/or co-conspirator of each of the remaining Defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the scope of such agency, employment, and/or conspiracy and with the permission and consent of other co-Defendants.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

- during the morning hours of June 24, 2010, at or around the 12300 block of Osborne Street in the Pacoima area of the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles. At approximately 11:30 a.m. on that date, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and other heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers, while acting under color of law and in the course and scope of their employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, confronted Plaintiff as Plaintiff sat inside his vehicle. Without identifying themselves as police officers, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the other Defendant DOE Officers yelled, "Put your hands up!" Plaintiff, believing that he was being robbed, complied with the command and raised his arms.
- 16. Without warning, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the other heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers proceeded to assault and batter Plaintiff by acts which included, but were not limited to, repeatedly and unjustifiably discharging their department issued firearms at the person of Plaintiff, inflicting several gunshot wounds, including gunshot wounds to Plaintiff's back. At no time during the course of these events did Plaintiff pose any reasonable or credible threat of violence to the involved officers, nor did he do anything to justify the force used against him, and the same was deadly, excessive, unnecessary, and unlawful.
- 17. Both prior to and during the time in which he was shot, Plaintiff had his arms raised in the air, was not carrying a weapon anywhere on his person, and posed no reasonable or credible threat of violence to the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers who shot him, nor to any other individual. Both prior to and during the time in which he was shot, Plaintiff made no aggressive movements, no furtive gestures, and no physical movements which would suggest to a reasonable police officer that he was armed with any kind of weapon, or had the will, or the ability to inflict substantial bodily harm against any individual. Both prior to and during the

10

12

13

11

14 15

16 17

18

20

19

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

time in which the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers shot Plaintiff, the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers, who fired, were not faced with any circumstances which would have led a reasonable police officer to believe that Plaintiff posed the risk of death or serious bodily injury to any person.

FOR THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff EMMANUEL BRACY Against Defendant DETECTIVE CARL WORRELL, Defendant DETECTIVE DONALD WALTHERS, Defendant **DETECTIVE RICHARD GUZMAN, Defendant DETECTIVE RANDY** RICO, and the Heretofore Unknown Defendant DOE Officers for Violations of Civil Rights [42 U.S.C. § 1983])

- Plaintiff restates and incorporates by reference the foregoing 18. paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth in full at this point.
- 19. This cause of action is set forth herein to redress the deprivation, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, policy, custom, practice, and/or usage, of rights, privileges, and/or immunities secured to Plaintiff by the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, including, but not limited to, the right to be free from unreasonable governmental seizures of his person.
- Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereupon alleges that at all times 20. mentioned herein, the Defendant CITY employed the individual Defendants named herein, including Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers. The Defendant CITY provided its individual Defendant employees and agents, including the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers, with official badges and identification cards which designated and described the bearers as employees of the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department.
- 21. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that at all times relevant to the acts and omissions herein alleged, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers were employed by the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, and were acting under color of law and in the course

and scope of their employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department.

- 22. At approximately 11:30 a.m. on June 24, 2010, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and other heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers, while acting under color of law and in the course and scope of their employment with the Defendant CITY and the Los Angeles Police Department, confronted Plaintiff as Plaintiff sat inside his vehicle, which was parked at or around the 12300 block of Osborne Street in the Pacoima area of the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles. Without identifying themselves as police officers, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the other Defendant DOE Officers yelled, "Put your hands up!" Plaintiff, believing that he was being robbed, complied with the command and raised his arms.
- 23. Without warning, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the other heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers proceeded to assault and batter Plaintiff by acts which included, but were not limited to, repeatedly and unjustifiably discharging their department issued firearms at the person of Plaintiff, inflicting several gunshot wounds, including gunshot wounds to Plaintiff's back. At no time during the course of these events did Plaintiff pose any reasonable or credible threat of violence to the involved officers, nor did he do anything to justify the force used against him, and the same was deadly, excessive, unnecessary, and unlawful.
- 24. Both prior to and during the time in which he was shot, Plaintiff had his arms raised in the air, was not carrying a weapon anywhere on his person, and posed no reasonable or credible threat of violence to the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers who shot him, nor to any other individual. Both prior to and during the time in which he was shot, Plaintiff made no aggressive movements, no furtive gestures, and no physical movements which would suggest to a reasonable police officer that he was armed with any kind of weapon, or had the will, or the ability to

inflict substantial bodily harm against any individual. Both prior to and during the time in which the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers shot Plaintiff, the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers, who fired, were not faced with any circumstances which would have led a reasonable police officer to believe that Plaintiff posed the risk of death or serious bodily injury to any person.

- 25. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers acted under color and pretense of law, and under color of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, practices, customs, and/or usages of the State of California and the Defendant CITY. The Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers deprived Plaintiff of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured to him by the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States, including, but not limited to, the right to be free from unreasonable governmental seizures of his person.
- 26. Plaintiff had the right to be free from unreasonable governmental seizures of his person, a right which was secured to Plaintiff by the provisions of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and by 42 U.S.C. § 1983. All of these interests were implicated by the wrongful conduct of Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers, which proximately caused severe injuries to Plaintiff, including, but not limited to, gunshot wounds to Plaintiff's person, including gunshot wounds to Plaintiff's back.
- 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that in unreasonably seizing his person, as described in the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint, Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers acted outside the scope of their jurisdiction and without authorization of law, and acted willfully, maliciously, knowingly, with reckless disregard and callous indifference to the known consequences of their acts and omissions, and purposefully with the intent

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to deprive Plaintiff of his federally protected rights and privileges, and did in fact violate the aforementioned rights and privileges, thereby warranting punitive and exemplary damages against Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the Defendant DOE Officers in an amount to be proven at the trial of this matter.

28. As a direct and proximate result of the wrongful, intentional, and malicious acts and omissions of Defendant DETECTIVES WORRELL, WALTHERS, GUZMAN, RICO, and the heretofore unknown Defendant DOE Officers, Plaintiff was placed in great fear for his life and physical well being, and has suffered and continues to suffer extreme and severe mental anguish, as well as great mental and physical pain and injury, all to his damage in a sum to be determined at trial. As a further direct and proximate result of the wrongful, intentional, and malicious acts and omissions of the Defendant Detectives and DOE Officers, Plaintiff was shot on June 24, 2010, and suffered severe injuries which include, but are not limited to, gunshot wounds to his person, including gunshot wounds to his back. As a further proximate result of the Defendant Detectives' and DOE Officers' wrongful, intentional, and malicious acts and omissions, Plaintiff has been required to employ, and did in fact employ, physicians and surgeons to examine, treat, and care for him, and has incurred and continues to incur expenses for emergent medical services and medical treatment and care in an amount according to proof at trial.

30. Plaintiff is entitled to and hereby demands costs, attorneys' fees, and expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

1

///

///

23

24

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows: 1 For general damages in an amount according to proof at trial; 1. 2 2. For medical and related expenses according to proof at trial; 3 3. For costs of suit incurred herein; For attorneys' fees incurred herein, as provided by law; 4. 5 For punitive damages against the individual Defendants in their 5. 6 individual capacities in an amount according to proof at trial; and 7 For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 6. 8 **JURY DEMAND** 10 Plaintiff hereby demands that a jury be empaneled for the trial of this matter. 11 12 DATED: December 18, 2013 Respectfully submitted, 13 THE COCHRAN FIRM CALIFORNIA 14 15 16 17 BAN R. GYONGYOS orneys for Plaintiff EMMANUEL 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

Y (-) DY A INTERPRETED (Ch1-1-1	1		VIL COVE.				
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check I	İ	DEFENDANTS CONV. OF LOG LANCEY FOR DEFENDANCE CARY, WORDEN A. DEFENDANCE CONV.					
EMMANUEL BRACY, an indi	1	CITY OF LOS ANGELES; DETECTIVE CARL WORRELL; DETECTIVE DONALD WALTHERS; DETECTIVE RICHARD GUZMAN; DETECTIVE					
			The state of the s	RANDY RICO; and DO	化氯化物 化氯化甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲		DETECTIVE
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Acyourself, provide same.) BRIAN T. DUNN, ES JAMON R. HICKS, E THE COCHRAN FIRM 4929 Wilshire Bouleve Los Angeles, Californi Telephone: (323) 435-	SQ. (SBN 232747) M CALIFORNIA ard, Suite 1010 ia 90010	If you are repro	esenting	Attorneys (If Known)			
	ON (Place an X in one box only	.,	III. CIT	IZENSHIP OF PRINC	TIDAT DADTING	Ton Dissensity Cook	. O-l-
	·		(Plac	e an X in one box for p			PTF DEF
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	f X 3 Federal Question Government Not	a Party)	Citizen of T			or Principal Place n this State	4 🗀 4
2 U.S. Government Defenda	ant 4 Diversity (Indicat of Parties in Item	III)		unother State 2	of Business i	and Principal Place n Another State	5 5
			Citizen or S Foreign (3 Foreign Natio	on	6 6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or	<u>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * </u>					7	
	ved from 3 Remanded fro Court Appellate Co		nstated or L opened	5 Transferred from (specify):	another district	6 Multi- District Litigation	7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judge
V. REQUESTED IN COMP	LAINT: JURY DEMAND:	X Yes	☐ No (Cl	neck 'Yes' only if deman	nded in complaint,)		
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.I				MONEY DEMANDE		?: \$	
	ite the U.S. Civil Statute under	which you are					e unless diversity
			_			•	
42 U.S.C. Section 1983.	Action for violations of	ı cıvıı rıgn	ns arising	g out of officer in	voived shootin	g incident.	
AND THE PROPERTY OF STATE OF S	W. L. W. L. W. L. V.					<u> </u>	
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place of SUIT)	CONTRACT	tro-	ORTS	TORTS	PRISO	STEPS SEED TO SEE	LABOR
400 State Reapportionment	110 Insurance		AL INJURY	PERSONAL	PETIT	IONE	LABOR 10 Fair Labor
410 State Reapportionment	120 Marine	310 Airp	plane	PROPERTY	510 Moti	ions to	Standards Act
430 Banks and Banking	130 Miller Act		plane Product				20 Labor/Mgmt, Relations
	140 Negotiable Instrument	ļ (m. rum)	oility ault, Libel &	371 Truth in Let		eas Corpus 73	Relations Labor/Mgmt.
460 Deportation	150 Recovery of Overpayment &	Slan		Property Da			Reporting &
470 Racketeer Influenced	Enforcement of		. Employers'	385 Property Da		damus/	Disclosure Act
and Corrupt	Judgment		oility ·	Product Lia			O Railway Labor Act
Organizations	151 Medicare Act	340 Mari	ine ine Product	BANKRUPTO	y 550 Civil	Rights	Other Labor
480 Consumer Credit 290 Cable/Sat TV	152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl.		ility	422 Appeal 28 U	isc L 555 Priso	n Condition	Litigation
810 Selective Service	Veterans)		or Vehicle	158 .	FORFEI	FURE/ 79 LTY	1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act
850 Securities/Commodities/	153 Recovery of		or Vehicle luct Liability	423 Withdrawal USC 157	28 610 Agric		ERTY RIGHTS
Exchange	Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits		er Personal	CIVILRIGHT	620 Other		0 Copyrights
875 Customer Challenge 12	160 Stockholders' Suits	Injur	ry	441 Voting	Drug	E 83	0 Patent
USC 3410 390 Other Statutory Actions	190 Other Contract		onal Injury-	442 Employmen		Related 840	0 Trademark AL SECURITY
891 Agricultural Act	195 Contract Product		Malpractice onal Injury-	443 Housing/Acc			1 HIA (1395ff)
892 Economic Stabilization	Liability		luct Liability	444 Welfare	881	·	2 Black Lung (923)
Act	196 Franchise		estos Persona		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	or Laws 🔲 863	3 DIWC/DIWW
893 Environmental Matters	REAL PROPERTY	Injur Liabi	y Product	Disabilities - Employment		11	(405(g))
894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Info, Act	210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	IMMIGR		446 American wi	=		4 SSID Title XVI 5 RSI (405(g))
900 Appeal of Fee Determi-	230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	462 Natur		Disabilities -			AL TAX SUITS
nation Under Equal	240 Torts to Land	Appl	lication	Other	690 Other	,	Taxes (U.S.
Access to Justice	245 Tort Product Liability		eas Corpus-	X 440 Other Civil			Plaintiff or
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	290 All Other Real Property		n Detainee r Immigration	Rights		071	Defendant) IRS - Third Party
	İ	Actio					26 USC 7609
	AN A	neg s	A A ===		1		
	se Number:	3-(<u> 193</u>	50	DAG TOTAL	copen per over	
AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.							

CV-71 (05/08)

Case 2:13-cv-09350-JC Document 1 Filed 12/19/13 Page 12 of 12 Page ID #:17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

CV-71 (05/08)		CIVIL	COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2					
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))						
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.						
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))						
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))						
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)						
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))						
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	Cause of Action					
Key to Statistical codes relating	to Social Security	Cases:						
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)								
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORI	NEY (OR PRO PEF	BRIAN T. DUNN	Date December 17, 2013					
Note: In land condemnation ca								
			a, or San Luis Obispo Counties					
County of Los Ange	ies	-						
County in this District:*	1		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved.								
(c) List the County in this Di	strict; California Co	ounty outside of this District;	State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.					
County of Los Ange	les							
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
(b) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).								
(h) List the County in this Di	atriate California C	overty outside of this District	State if other than California, or Equator Country is which ELAW.					
County of Los Ange	eles							
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
(a) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).								
IX. VENUE: (When comple								
			rk or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.					
			bstantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or					
(Check all boxes that apply)	(Check all boxes that apply) A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or							
Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:								
If yes, list case number(s):								
If yes, list case number(s): VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? X No Yes								
	SES: Has this action	on been previously filed in this	s court and dismissed, remanded or closed? X No Yes					

Page 2 of 2